

REMARKS

The claims have been amended in view of the Office action and in view of the remarks which follow, the claims and the application as a whole are believed to be in condition for allowance. While the remarks below are generally the same as in the Amendment of 21 July 2008, they have been edited for the purpose of clarifying the language and dealing with the issue of Non Compliance of the Amendment of 21 July 2008.

Non Compliant Claim Objections

In section 1 of the original Detailed Action, several claims were objected on the grounds of being non-compliant. It is believed that those grounds of rejection have been overcome. In the recent Notice of 13 November 2008 it was pointed out three claims 55-57 in the Amendment of 21 July 2008 were non-compliant. Applicants apologize for having made inadvertent errors in the editing of those claims. Those errors have been corrected. Accordingly, that issue is believed to be moot. While the undersigned is unaware of any other errors; but if any errors are found the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below or by FAX at the earliest convenience..

Claim Objections

In section 3 of the Detailed Action, claim 25 was found objectionable. As claim 25 has been canceled, that issue is believed to be moot.

Specification

Because the specification was found to be confusing and needed correction of grammatical errors, many amendments of the specification have been made but it is respectfully submitted that it is believed that no new matter has been added. The names of elements in the drawings having the same reference indicia are now believed to be consistent in view of the amendments pertaining thereto. Additional corrections have been made in this amendment without adding any new matter.

Serial No.: 10/796,426	Confirmation No.: 1895	Art Unit: 2183
-------------------------------	------------------------	----------------

Replacement Drawings

Replacement drawings were filed contemporaneously with the amendment of 21 July 2008 in an effort to comply with the rules and to add labels drawn from the text to make the drawings more easily understood. The drawings submitted herewith have been corrected without adding any new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In section 4 of the detailed action, claims 1, 4, 8-13, 19-28, 30, 31, 34, 38-40, and 46-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiles et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,425,075 (Stiles) in view of Cummins U.S. Patent No. 6,263,427 (Cummins)

As to claim 1, in Section 4 of the Detailed Action, the Office Action cites FIG. 2 of Stiles and text in Cols. 9 and 10 thereof where Stiles teaches a method of operating a computer having a pipelined processor having "First Level Branch Prediction Cache 152" and "Second Level Branch Prediction Cache 155" which were alleged to be Branch Target Buffers (BTB's). The "First Level Branch Prediction Cache 152" is shown in detail in FIG. 3 and described at Col. 10, lines 37-40 as containing a Least Recently Used (LRU) logic block 181 which selects a BPC line to be overwritten by a new block of instruction data, which clearly is not a LIFO (Last In First Out) function.

Applicants respectfully submit that the LRU of Stiles does not suggest the FIFO of claim 1.. A FIFO is "First In - First Out" device. In the case of an LRU (Least Recently Used) algorithm is used, when a new entry is to be entered in a set-associative array (storage device), it determines which entry is to be replaced. These two structures differ since a FIFO replaces the oldest entry in the queue/storage device (the oldest is the first entry placed into the queue/storage device). With respect to an LRU, the oldest entry could have been the last entry referenced. In such a case, it would be the MRU (Most Recently Used). As such, some other entry, the LRU, entry which is not the oldest entry, would be replaced. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that what Stiles teaches is divergent from the subject matter of the three amended independent claims in the instant application and it is respectfully submitted that it teaches away therefrom with regard to the FIFO feature.

Serial No.: 10/796,426	Confirmation No.: 1895	Art Unit: 2183
-------------------------------	------------------------	----------------

In section 6 of the detailed action, the Office Action admits that Stiles fails to disclose delaying the pipeline until a branch prediction unit finishes the prediction, but it is alleged that Cummins discloses what Stiles lacks referring to col 8 lines 32-42 thereof opining that Stiles would have been motivated to emulate Fig. 7 of Cummins to reduce hardware, processor area, and complexity of correcting the delay. However, stalling the processor is not what is claimed by the amended claims herein since the specification calls for delaying the decoding of a branch, not stalling of the processor. Thus, the claims have been corrected to call for delaying of decoding, not stalling the processor. In accordance with this invention, the pipeline is delayed by blocking redundant data, but the processor is not stalled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Cummins is believed not to be relevant to the amended claims.

In section 7 of the detailed action it is stated as follows:

"Stiles fails to disclose it comprising blocking an entry matching an entry within the recent entry queue from being written into the BTB and that the BTB and recent entry queue are set associative."

"Official Notice is taken that arranging the caches in a tiered arrangement (like a typical L1 -L2 cache setup) is well known in the art. A tiered arrangement of cache levels allows the system to write an entry into only the L1 cache rather than spending the time and resources to write into both the L1 and L2. Upon eviction from the L1 cache, the entry is written into the L2. The examiner asserts that with this arrangement, any entry (including those that match current entries in the L1) will be blocked from writing to the L2 cache.

"Official Notice is taken that the recent entry queue (and therefore, BTB) can use set associative rather than direct mapped. Stiles would have been motivated to utilize this change if he desired to alter the size of the recent entry queue. Then a set associative technique would be the preferred technique."

"It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have arranged Stiles' caches in a tiered L1-L2 arrangement for the benefit of conserving system resources on writing an entry to the BTB.

It is respectfully submitted that the function of an L1-L2 cache setup does not perform the function of comparing entries being made to the BTB in parallel with the recent entry queue to avoid redundant entries into the BTB. It is respectfully submitted that that L1 and L2 caches setups do not operate in that way. Thus, it is believed that the official notice allegation cannot be sustained. It is submitted that a BTB is different from an instruction/data cache. In an instruction/data cache, access is being made to a

Serial No.: 10/796,426	Confirmation No.: 1895	Art Unit: 2183
-------------------------------	------------------------	----------------

particular/precise address. In a BTB, a starting address is provided and the **closest** branch to that address is reported. As such, a BTB does not work with the same principles as that of a data/instruction cache. As such, there are short falls to not having the 1st level branch table as a subset of the 2nd level branch table as suggested in section 7 of the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the case defined by IBM where the 1st level table does predictions is only in the case of detected loops where the known prediction from the 1st level table will be the same as that from the second level table. In all cases where a loop is not involved, it can not be guaranteed that the prediction from the 1st and 2nd level tables can be the same.

It is respectfully submitted that it is not possible to respond to the portion of the Office Action which trailed off as follows:

"It further would have been obvious to allow...."

The statements in sections 8–27 of the Detailed Action are believed to be moot in view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks.

In view of the amendments and the above remarks, the claims and the application as a whole are now believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

No fee is believed to be due for the submission of this amendment. If any fees are required, however, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

In view of the amendments and the above remarks favorable action including allowance of the claims and the application as a whole are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Graham S. Jones, II/

Graham S. Jones, II, Attorney
Reg. No. 20,429

Telephone (845) 473-9118

Email: graham@grahamjones.com

FAX (845) 485-9399